

CASE NO.: 1187.003  
Serial No.: 10/812,603  
December 12, 2005  
Page 7

PATENT  
Filed: March 30, 2004

Remarks

The indicated allowability of Claims 2-20 and 22-30 is gratefully acknowledged. Claims 1 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Paul et al., USPN 6,647,764 and Satoh, USPN 6,448,689. It is believed that the cancellation of Claims 1 and 21 and the rewriting of allowable Claims 2 and 22 in independent form overcomes the anticipation rejections.

Also, Claims 2-10 and 22-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner has found the recitation of "high impedance" to be imprecise and relative. It is believed that the present amendments specifying a particular impedance threshold as disclosed on, e.g., page 2, line 5 or removing the term altogether overcome the indefiniteness rejections.

Claim 11 has been objected to for being awkwardly worded, with the examiner suggesting removal of the first recitation of the word "in", which has been done by this amendment. The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Rogitz  
Registration No. 33,549  
Attorney of Record  
750 B Street, Suite 3120  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1187-3.AMD

BEST AVAILABLE COPY